

BACONIANA.

VOL. II. *Third Series.* OCTOBER, 1904. No. 8.

LEYCESTER'S COMMONWEALTH.*

ON the title page of the Northumberland House MSS., among other entries we find "Leycester's Commonwealth." As this occurs as one item in what is apparently a catalogue of the underlying contents of the portfolio in which these MSS. of work, presumably by Bacon, are contained, the question at once arises, Did Bacon write this as well as the rest? Part of the MS. of Leycester's Commonwealth is included in this collection, but only part, that which is contained between pp. 55 and 160 in this edition. The presumption of Bacon's authorship is not so strong in reference to this as to the other writings. For Leycester's Commonwealth is a severe and most damaging indictment of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leycester, who was, when the book was published, the most powerful man in the Kingdom. The book was apparently written and published about the year 1584, when Bacon was 23 years old. It was printed on the Continent, probably at Antwerp. Probably no English printer or publisher would handle such compromising matter. Every effort was made to suppress it in

* *Leycester's Commonwealth*, a reprint of the 1641 edition. Edited by Frank J. Burgoyne, librarian of the Lambeth Public Libraries, pp. 247. Longmans, 1904. 7s. 6d.

England, where it excited considerable interest. Many copies were seized and destroyed, consequently it was much circulated in manuscript. In fact, as Mr. Burgoyne states, many more manuscript copies now exist in England, than copies of the printed book. Doubtless the copy found in the Northumberland House collection may be one of these, even although the writing is by an amanuensis of Bacon's. Still this does not entirely dispose of the presumption that Bacon was the author, and we may reasonably look for internal evidence bearing on the subject.

In the first place we need not be deterred by the description given of it by Sir Philip Sidney and the Government. The Queen spoke of it as "most malicious, false and scandalous, and such as none but an incarnate devil himself could dream to be true." But this invective is only in ordinary official style—"pretty Fanny's way"—and only means that the Government thought it dangerous. Sir Philip Sidney calls it an "inveterate and scurrilous libel," "characterised by all the venom and rancour that the most ruthless hatred could suggest." But it is remarkable that Sir Philip Sidney does not attempt to answer the libel; he only concerns himself with the lineage of his maternal ancestors. Surely Sir Philip Sidney would have answered it if he could. For it is worth an answer. Whether true or false, it is not scurrilous, or scandalous; no venom or rancour is manifest in its composition. It is indeed a most elaborate indictment of Leycester, but the style is calm and dignified; it is an eloquent, masterly and judicial statement, in which the alleged facts are stated without any artificial colouring, without a trace of invective or extravagance. We know that Leycester was, as Walpole said, "a bad man," and that the accusations of this pamphlet are in exact conformity with what we know of his life and ambitions. Froude

speaks of him as a scoundrel—"the most worthless of her Majesty's subjects." Consequently the unsupported invective of those who sought to suppress it rather confirms than confutes its accuracy.

As far as style is concerned there is nothing inconsistent with Bacon's authorship. For clear, concise, lucid, historic narrative, for masterly marshalling of facts, for brilliant literary style and lofty eloquence, it may challenge comparison with the writings of Bacon or the greatest masters of English literature. It resembles in this respect and in its general tone, Bacon's *Henry VII.* It is also curiously like the "Advertisement Touching a Holy War," for it is written in the form of a dialogue in which the speakers do not rapidly change, but generally take long innings; and neither argument nor statement of facts is confined to one of the interlocutors.

Nor is the temper and morality of the piece unworthy of Bacon. If he was gentle and charitable in his judgments, and had "the aspect of one that pitied men," this made him capable of fiery indignation against cruelty and oppression; and the pity of his nature intensified his anger against those whose cruelty was pitiless. Incapable of personal rancour, he was easily stirred to altruistic indignation.

Looking more closely at the sentiments as well as the structure of this work, we find first of all, Bacon's characteristic views in regard to religious and political toleration accurately reflected, a view that was by no means current at that time. Since every man wishes that the Prince or Government under which he lives should be of the same religion as himself, there is in this a possible motive for treason or rebellion. But so long as this does not lead to "some actual attempt or treaty against the life of the Prince or State, by rebellion or otherwise, we do not properly condemn them as traitors,"

nor enforce the statutes that make it unlawful for them to exercise the rites of their religion. So that Papists and Puritans may be "both guilty and guiltless," and neither should be condemned simply for their beliefs. This opinion is supported by much and cogent reference to actual experience in other countries, and by such remarkably Baconian sentiment as the following:—"Misery procureth amity, and the opinion of calamity moveth affection of mercy and compassion, even towards the wicked; the better fortune is subject to envy, and he that suffereth is thought to have the better cause" (p. 18).

The knowledge of law here displayed is most remarkable, and it is stated with the lucidity, the comprehensive completeness, and the technical accuracy of a practised lawyer. Legal points are expounded with a fulness of knowledge only possible to a professional lawyer. Indeed this may be used as an argument against Bacon's authorship, on the ground that when Bacon was only 23 or 24 it is scarcely likely that he would have acquired such a mastery, either of legal material or judicial form as this work shows, and that at this time he was more attracted by "Invention," and by his early philosophical designs,—his *partus masculus* and such like scientific introits,—than by law studies. But it must be remembered that Bacon's father was Lord Keeper, and that he had lived in a legal atmosphere all his life. Also he ripened early, and when his father died, when he was little more than a boy, his earnest legal studies began, and from sheer necessity, took a primary place in his occupations. So that although he had no great relish for these studies,—was *multum incola*, and often tempted to forsake them and betake himself to Cambridge and his books, as a pioneer in the mine of truth,—yet he did not either forsake or neglect the studies on which his livelihood depended; and as he in

all respects ripened early, he became a great lawyer, with the dignity and majesty of a Judge, long before he was solicitor or attorney, or chancellor. Before his public life began he was lecturer and reader in the Inns of Court to which he belonged. I see no reason why he should not have been competent to write law in the style of this work when he was in the third decade of his life. The legal arguments given with such amplitude and precision on pp. 171—194 may be still commended to law students as eminently deserving their study and admiration.

If in this respect this *brochure* is worthy of Bacon, it is as much so in the knowledge of English history which it displays. In explaining most exhaustively the origin and motive of the long strife between the houses of York and Lancaster, the writer is speaking of the same historic incidents which are the topics of historic plays in Shakespeare; and the Genealogies, and reasons for strife, contention and animosity between the rival houses, cover much the same ground as the *Henry IV.*, *V.*, and *VI.*, plays. Here, also, we find ample knowledge and lucid exposition quite worthy of Bacon, dealing with events and times which he had carefully studied.

There are many other allusions which are common to this work and Bacon's other writings. The expulsion of the entire family of the Tarquins for the crime of one member is referred to, pp. 47-8. Calamities resulting from the favourites of princes are illustrated by the case of Gaveston and Edward II., p. 229. The favour shewn by Queen Margaret to the Duke of Suffolk, and the beheading of Suffolk, when he attempted escape by sea, remind one irresistably of the same narrative in *2 Henry VI.* Julius Cæsar must almost of necessity make his appearance in such a work, if written by Bacon. Accordingly, his friendship with Brutus, who killed him, is not forgotten, and is used to point a moral for his

own prince and his own times, p. 213-4. The writer is partial to Latin quotations, pp. 47, 84, 105, 237. And it would be well to ascertain—which is not at present within my opportunity—whether these quotations are accurately given, or whether they contain such slips and changes as Bacon often made when quoting from memory.

Many phrases and turns of expression are found to which Bacon was much addicted. *Painted words* occurs twice, pp. 25, 121. The *aspect* of princes, as enjoyed by those living near the Court or in presence, is referred to, p. 76. The power and importance of *opinion*, or current reputation, as a factor in public life, is alluded to in the passage already quoted. It is found in pp. 18, 87, 88, 237. The *wheel* of felicity is at p. 108. In Bacon and Shakespeare there are about twenty of these *wheels*. Machiavelli is referred to twice, pp. 127, 237. Aristotle is mentioned, p. 115. *Money* as the *sinews* of war is twice spoken of, pp. 84, 114. The tempest of tyranny is characterized as *boisterous*. No reader of Shakespeare could, without a start of surprise, read such a sentence as this:—"But if ever I hear at other hands of these matters hereafter, I shall surely be quack-britch [*i.e.*, apparently, agitated, shaking with fear], and *think every bush a thief*."

No less suggestive of Bacon's hand is the following, in which Bacon's favourite allusions to planetary predominance, and the guidance of mariners by the Polestar, is reproduced:—"Throughout all England my Lord of Leycester is taken for *Dominus fac totum*, whose excellency above others is infinite, whose authority is absolute, whose commandment is dreadful, whose dislike is dangerous, and whose favour is omnipotent. And for his will, though it be seldom law, yet always is his power above law : and therefore we lawyers, in all cases brought before us, have as great regard to his inclina-

tion as astronomers have to the planet predominant, or as seamen have to the North Pole. For as they that sail do direct their course according to the situation and direction of that star which guideth them at the Pole, and as astronomers who make prognostications do foretell of things to come according to the aspect of the planet predominant, or bearing rule for the time, so do we guide our client's bark, and do prognosticate what is like to be the issue of his cause, by the aspect and inclination of my Lord of Leycester" (p. 82).

If Bacon did not write this it must have been written by his double.

I should like to quote the passage of surpassing eloquence, with that irresistible rush of accumulation which marks a practised orator, in which the writer describes the "infinite ways of gaining that Leycester hath." There are about fifteen separate items in the clauses of this tremendous indictment (pp. 85—87) in support of the assertion that "his treasure must needs in one respect be greater than that of her Majesty; for he layeth up whatsoever he getteth, and his expenses he casteth upon the purse of his Princes."

The metaphor of a river *stopped*, its power augmented by resistance, is familiar to all readers of Shakespeare and Bacon. Here it is again:—"For as a great and violent river, the more it is stopped or contraried, the more it riseth and swelleth big, and in the end dejecteth with more force the thing that made resistance, so his Lordship being the great and mighty Potentate of this realm, and accustomed to have his will in all things, cannot bear to be crossed or resisted by any man, though it were in his own necessary defence" (p. 101).

We are reminded of *Promus* notes, and of many Shakespearean passages by such a clause as this:—"Ambition being always the *mother* of suspicion." Bacon was accustomed to look on various mental

qualities as bearing a sort of parental relation to one another, a habit which is reflected in the brief and almost cryptic *Promus* note 1,412:—*A son of somewhat.*

This *mother* passage may be compared with the following:—

"Fear is the mother of deformity" (*Conference of Pleasure: Fortitude*).

"Natural History . . . the nursing mother of Philosophy" (*De Aug.* II., iii.).

"This canon [text of Scripture] is the mother of all canons against Heresy" (*Med. Sac.*).

"The mother of Virtue is real good, so the mother of Desire is apparent good" (*De Aug.* II., xiii.).

"Fortune is to be honoured if it be but for her daughters, Confidence and Authority" (*Antitheta*).

"Fear . . . the mother of sedition" (*Essay of Union*).

"Hardness ever of hardiness is mother" (*Cymb.* III., vi., 21).

"Sable night mother of Dread and Fear" (*Lucrece*, 118).

For most of these references I am indebted to Mrs. Pott.

Doubtless the same kind of expression may be found in other writers, especially in the *Anatomy of Melancholy*. But it is more characteristic of Bacon than of any other author.

The writer refers in a guarded and cautious way to the more than friendly relations between Leycester and the Queen, and to his own insinuation, that he might become the father of her child; and to the murder of Amy Robsart, his lawful wife, in order that the Royal alliance might be legitimately accomplished. In reference to this it is clear that Bacon would not have handled this delicate topic at all, much less have referred to it in terms imputing infamy to one of those concerned, if he himself had been the offspring of this semi-attached, semi-detached, couple. The writer was

evidently quite familiar with most of the personages about the Queen, and with the Queen herself, but there is no indication that he had any exceptional connection with Royalty or the Court.

I do not offer these comments and comparisons as a conclusive proof that Bacon wrote "Leycester's Commonwealth." I merely suggest this as possible, and as not inconsistent with the actual contents, as to matter and form, of this remarkable composition. The discussion of this question arises immediately out of the Northumberland House MS., is almost prompted by it, and it may be discussed on its own merit quite apart from the Bacon-Shakespeare Controversy. It need not share the contumely of our "Craze," or be tossed aside as one of the phantoms of our insanity. It is not a crank, but an intelligible and lawful problem. If Bacon, however, is accepted as the author, a very strong additional buttress is supplied to our contention, because it goes far to prove the common authorship of all the essays, and letters, and pamphlets, and plays, whose titles are scribbled on the tell-tale title page, except those which are expressly attributed to other writers,—“Nash, and inferior players.”

R. M. THEOBALD.

THE DATE OF *THE COMEDY OF ERRORS.*

THE play of *The Comedy of Errors* was learnedly and exhaustively dealt with by Mr. Bompas in the April number (at p. 115 of Vol. II., third Series) of this Magazine. The following evidence as to the date at which the play must have been originally written strongly confirms the conclusion on this head there arrived at.

The article suggests the play to have been originally written as early as 1576. In that year Francis Bacon had just left the University of Cambridge, and the play was exactly such an academic one as would be naturally written by a clever youth just fresh from college. It was founded upon the then untranslated classical play of the *Menæchmi* of Plautus. Mr. Bompas points out, too, that the play was again performed at Court in 1581. This is the first occasion on which we read that it was played there subsequently to Bacon's return from abroad, two years before. It is but natural to suppose that it was, after the fashion usual with the "Shakespeare plays," accordingly "written up to date" on that occasion. Nothing is more striking to an Englishman who is travelling abroad for the first time than the sight of the vines climbing on stakes in the vineyards in the South of France, and to elms in Italy. When *The Comedy of Errors* was written by Bacon in 1576 he had never seen this. It is morally certain that the allusion to the sight was introduced by him in 1581 on his then revision of the play. It is in Act II., Scene 2. The play yet again was performed, in December, 1594, on an occasion on which Queen Elizabeth is claimed to have been present; when Shakspeare, the young actor

of Stratford, for the first time, played before her Majesty. On this occasion many of the judges and great lawyers of the day would be certain to be present. Plainly, it would be highly appropriate that the "Sorcerer," who was Master of the Ceremonies, should on such occasion introduce into the play a characteristic quibble and joke, including a pun about a "fine and recovery." And we accordingly find it done in Act II., Scene 2, the very same part of the play as that in which the writer's experiences of foreign travel had previously found mention. An explanation of the then familiar process of "Fine and Recovery" is pointed out by Mr. Reed (page 257, No. 488), to be also given by Bacon in his "Use of the Law," written at some date not now exactly known, though beyond question at no late period of his life. Attention is directed to these points, since they all have considerable bearing upon the question as to the date at which *The Comedy of Errors* was first written; and they seem to be, like the main question, considerably corroborated by the evidence which will be mentioned below.

On a careful examination of the structure of the play, with a view to ascertaining with what well-known productions of Bacon's pen it contains matter in common, we are at once struck by a startling fact. We find that, of the thirty-six plays contained in the folio of 1623, *The Comedy of Errors* is the only one which contains no matter whatever which is also found in the Promus, or Note Book, kept by Bacon. Every other play in the volume, save this, will be found to contain some passage or passages (many have numerous ones) also contained in the Promus. Why does this play alone contain none?

The explanation is obvious and easy, and strongly confirms Mr. Bompas's conclusion that the play was first written in 1576. The "Promus," it will be recol-

lected, was not commenced until December, 1594, and not much was done on it till the following January. This was about eighteen years after *The Comedy of Errors* had been originally written. Though the play was "written up" about the same time (1594) for reproduction at Gray's Inn, nothing occurred which suggested insertion among the striking expressions, by which Bacon's attention had been so arrested that he was beginning to note them in the *Promus*. It evidently never occurred to Bacon that the effort of his youth contained any expression which deserved to be extracted and preserved in his Note Book for future use. He seemingly had commenced the Note Book with a view to keeping in mind remarkable expressions, having been warned to do this by Greene's comparatively recent death, and by finding he had already forgotten some of the Spanish expressions he had picked up from the deceased. It is, accordingly, quite natural that there should be in the play of *The Comedy of Errors* no expressions common alike to it and the Note Book, or "*Promus*."

Expressions found in the play, and common alike to it and to other writings of Bacon, are altogether only six in number; much fewer than in any other Shakespeare play. They shall be dealt with one by one, as they are thus so limited in number. The presence of each of these seems to be quite naturally accounted for, and to be quite consistent with the early date ascribed to the original composition of the play by Mr. Bompas.

Two of the allusions common alike to this play and to other known writings of Bacon are two classical stories. One is the comparatively common tale of Circe and her cup of enchantment. It is hardly surprising that the academic play of a young man should make allusion to a well-known classical story, again

referred to in later life by the writer ; especially as the allusion is made in terms which suggest no very striking “parallelism” or identity of thought on the subject. Indeed, the language does no more than suggest that the writer had, on both occasions, thought of and alluded to the legend of Circe, alike during his writing *The Comedy of Errors* and when he was—perhaps twenty years or a quarter of a century later—engaged in his *Advancement of Learning* (see Reed’s *Parallelisms*, page 242—3, No. 683).

But another classical story, alluded to both in *The Comedy of Errors* and in the *Sylva Sylvarum*, published nearly half a century later, does betray the identity of the two writers in a very singular way. Bacon in both made a mistake, and mistold the tale ; and in both places the mistake made is identical ! The classic writers of antiquity—Homer, Ovid, Virgil, and the less-known Hyginus—all unite in describing the ever-shifting Proteus as a being who, when captured, could only be got to prophesy by being bound down by a chain. But he is described in the play (Act II., sc. 2) as one who could be got to prophesy by being held by the sleeve. In the *Sylva Sylvarum* identically the same error, or “variant,” is made in telling the story. Our friends, the “orthodox Stratfordians,” explain the notorious mistake, in referring to Aristotle’s remark as to the unfitness of young men for *political* philosophy as having reference to *moral* philosophy, made in common in *Troilus and Cressida* and in Bacon’s *Advancement of Learning* (Reed’s *Parallelisms*, p. 45, No. 69), by saying that Erasmus was the originator of the blunder, and that both writers “doubtless” followed him. But to what writer, earlier than 1576, can they refer as having misled Bacon at eighteen, and again in 1623 ; or the Stratford actor, at any date they please to fix as that at which they think that he “must” have written *The Comedy of Errors* ?

Two more allusions, also made in subsequent prose work writings by Bacon, are also found in *The Comedy of Errors*. One of these goes to identify its writer with Bacon's physical characteristics; the other betrays one of his marked mental views. All his life, Bacon suffered from indigestion, or "Dyspepsia." *The Comedy of Errors* tells us (Act V., Scene 1) that "Unquiet meals make ill digestions." Bacon, in some private Memoranda dated in 1608, notes a similar experience, and that one of the causes productive of indigestion is "Strife at meats." The parallelism is noted by Mr. Edwin Reed on page 200, and is No. 375. The marked mental view held by Bacon, which was at some time incorporated into the play, was his doctrine as to the human soul. He held, as he confesses in his *De Augmentis*, published in 1622, that this doctrine "has two parts; the one treating of the rational soul, which is divine; and the other of the irrational, which we have in common with the brutes." What is the enquiry of the Duke in Act V., Scene 1 of *The Comedy of Errors*, but one made in this very spirit, when in answer to Adriana's declaration that she sees two husbands, he replies,

"One of these men is Genius to the other; . . .
Which is the natural man, and which the spirit?"

Mr. Edwin Reed has this as No. 261 on page 146.

Neither of these passages in *The Comedy of Errors* reflects, it is true, very much of Bacon's deep philosophy; nor do any portions of this play do this. But this is exactly consistent with the theory that the play was written at a period of his life (about 18) when the philosophy of its writer would naturally not yet have assumed many correct forms. Could it indeed be otherwise?

"*The Shakespeare Story: An Outline*," as told by the

Shakespeare plays, will, it is the writer's hope, be laid by him before the general public within a few weeks; and will help to popularize the tale they tell; and to render those familiar with the story, who have not the patience to read a long or a "learned" book. But the "Evidence" on which the story rests will, it is believed, be appreciated by those who, like the readers of this Magazine, are already deeply versed in the subject, and are consequently able to appreciate the strength of evidence such as is here presented. The proofs offered in this "Evidence" will contain, amongst other matters, an analysis of the structure and contents of the 1623 Folio, of a nature somewhat similar to that which has here been submitted as to the date of the *Comedy of Errors*.

G. PITT-LEWIS.

MORE LIGHT ON *TWELFTH NIGHT*.

II.

WE have already seen by "Manningham's Diary" that some part of the plot of *Twelfth Night* was used first by Plautus, B.C. 224. And that in more modern times Niccolo Secchi, the Italian, produced his version. There seems to have been an earlier Italian version, called *Gl'Ingannati*, by an unnamed member of the *Accademia degli Intronati*, of Siena. Dr. Garnett says this play was published in 1537.

Thomas Love Peacock translated the scenes relating to *Twelfth Night*, and this was reprinted in the third volume of Sir Henry Cole's edition of his works.

Gervinus believes this Italian version was taken from the Spanish one.

But the Spanish *Los Engaños* which was supposed to

be written by Lope de Rueda, called the father of Spanish Comedy, appeared first in 1556. My authority for this is *Mariaro Ferrer é Izquierdo, Extudio Historica*, Madrid, 1899.

The Spanish version makes a very interesting link in our knotted chain, one which I look forward to discuss later. At present our business is with our English play, apparently at one time known as *Malvolio*.

Among other very interesting things in Windsor Royal Library, I saw the other day the copy of the Shakespeare Folio which Charles the Martyr treasured when imprisoned in Carisbrooke.

Peculiar interest attaches to it, for Charles had scored out with his pen the title, and written *Malvolio* instead.

Now the steward who thus gave his name to the play was one of four characters newly introduced into the old foreign plot by our English poet.

The other three were the Countess (or Princess as she is called), Olivia's uncle,—Sir Toby Belch,—and his friend Sir Andrew Ague Cheek, and the Lady Olivia's clown, Feste.

Halliwell Phillipps tells us that *Twelfth Night* was appreciated at an early period as one of the author's most popular creations. And when Ordish says that "there is little doubt that the characters are drawn from originals in London," one hardly wonders at its great popularity.

In Mr. Bompas' *Problem of the Plays*, p. 59, he tells us that one version of the play under discussion appeared as early as 1584 or 1585, as a thinly-veiled satire on members of the English Court, quoting as his authority: "*Renascence Drama*, by William Thomson, 1880."

This is more than likely, but what I hold is that our version as published in the Folio is a faithful reflexion of certain living personages well known at the time, and that the mirror has been held up to actual breathing

flesh and blood realities that can be traced and recognised.

Let us take Malvolio first, who was so well known to Charles that he insists on giving his name to the Comedy. From his childhood, "Baby Charles" must have been familiar with the puritanical, self-conceited "politician," Sir William Fowler, son of the Thomas Fowler who had been so intimately connected with Mary, Queen of Scots, and the Lennoxes, Arabella Stuart's grandparents. William seems to have been engaged in negociations with England before James' accession, and to have been appointed secretary to Anne of Denmark about 1590.

Gervinus gives us the perfect picture of him when he describes Malvolio, "An austere puritan, pedantic, conscientious and true, grave and sober." "He regards himself as far superior to the society in his mistress's house." "He looks down contemptuously on shallow things." "Self love is therefore the distinguishing feature of his nature." He speaks of the "high soaring vanity of Malvolio," whose "thoughts soar in laughable fashion."

These quotations are quite enough for our purpose.

Will. Fowler is spoken of by E. T. Bradley, Arabella Stuart's biographer, as the "ridiculous William Fowler." "At once simpleton and buffoon, but extravagant as is his language, there is a ring of sincerity about his praises of the lady, which has led to the supposition that Fowler would, if he had dared, have joined the ranks of her suitors" (pp. 173—6). A letter from him to the Earl and Countess of Shrewsbury is quoted.

It shows what our Puritan thought of the frivolity of Anne of Denmark's Court.

Woodstock, Sept. 11th, 1603:—

"But I am too saucy and overbold," he says, "to

trouble your honours ; yet I cannot forbear from giving you advertisement of my great good fortune in obtaining the acquaintance of my Lady Arabella, who may be to the first seven, justly the eighth wonder of the world. If I durst I would write more plainly my opinion of things that fall out here among us, but I dare not, without your lordship's warrant, deal so. I send two sonnets, one is a conceit of mine drawn from an horloge, the other is that worthy and most virtuous lady, your niece."

The following is the absurd sonnet written to Arabella :—

"Whilst organs of vain sense transport the mind,
 Embracing objects both of sight and ear,
 Touch, smell, and taste, to which frail flesh inclined,
 Prefers such trash to things which are more dear ;
 Thou godly nymph, possesst with heavenly fear,
 Divine in soul, devout in life, and grave,
 Rapt from thy sense and sex, thy spirits doth steer
 Toys to avoid which reason doth bereave.
 O graces rare ! which time from shame shall save,
 Wherein thou breath'st (as in the seas doth fish,
 In salt not saltish) exempt from the grave
 Of sad remorse, the worldling's wish.
 O ornament both of thy self and sex,
 And mirror bright where virtues doth reflex !
 In salo sine sale."

He corresponds much with Arabella's relations and describes how, amidst the gay Court, she "sets apart certain hours every day for lecture, reading, hearing of service and preaching." What he thought when she took an active part in the Masque of Beauty in a gorgeous costume and jewels we dare hardly imagine ! He was, as we believe, a Scotchman, sharing, no doubt, the unpopularity of his nation. Knight, in his "London" (p. 325, Vols. III.—IV.), tells how their self-sufficiency and pride made them disliked in London, and how they were regarded "as a set of

hungry adventurers flocking southward in the train of King Jamie, to pick up the crumbs that fell from the Royal table."

A further proof of his character comes to us in the National Biography:

"Sir Will. Fowler was a Scottish poet, in France, before 1581, whence he was driven, so he said, 'by the Jesuits.' Fowler, in answer to a calumnious letter, sets forth what he alleges to be the 'errors of Roman Catholics.' He also claims acquaintance with the Earl of Crawford, Sir James Balfour, and other distinguished Scottish statesmen. He was prominent as a Burgess of Edinburgh, and about 1590 became Secretary to Queen Anne, and, engaged in negotiations with England, accompanied his royal mistress to England in 1603, and was re-appointed, not only her Secretary, but Master of the Requests. His leisure was always devoted to poetry. Fowler's sister was married to the first Laird of Hawthornden."

Knight says, "The Scotsman and Presbyterian came to be regarded as synonymous terms." In fact, Fowler was as Maria describes him: "Sometimes he is a kind of Puritan." When she calls him "Monsieur," the title seems to allude to his stay in France. In the interview with him and the clown his surname is wrapped in a conceit. (Act IV., Sc. ii.)

Clown.—"What is the opinion of Pythagoras concerning WILDE FOWLE?"

Malvolio.—"That the soule of our grandam might happily inhabite a bird."

Clown.—"Feare to kill a woodcocke, lest thou dispossesse the soule of thy grandam."

Who but a *Fowler* would kill a woodcock, the authorised manipulator of springes?

Camden insists in his "Remains" on the inner meaning of surnames and nicknames, "He doth not

teach well which teacheth all, leaving nothing to subtle wits to sift out." (*Camden.*)

He quotes from Isodore :—

"*Granted Verity* that names among all nations are significant and not vain, senseless sounds."

"What's in a name?" Perhaps a key to make us wise.

Gilbert Talbot and Mary Cavendish, the Queen Elizabeth's cup-bearer, were Arabella's staunch friends always. She lived under Gilbert's care at one time, and she and her uncle were on good terms. He married Maria, or Mary, the sister of Arabella's mother, Elizabeth Cavendish.

Whether these two are immortalised as Maria and Toby I cannot say. The name Toby is not unlike Talbot, and we know that Elizabeth considered Gilbert her enemy, so that she might have been glad that he should be presented in a humourous light. This is a mere suggestion. It is with Sebastian and Olivia we have now to do.

Since writing my last article on this subject fresh evidence has made it still more clear that William Seymour, Lord Beauchamp's younger son, was the original of Sebastian.

As Malvolio stands for "Ill Will," so Sebastian stands for Seymour. The first syllable, as a Shakespearian pointed out to me, is undoubtedly the same; and then the word Bastion, part of the fortifications of a walled enclosure, and Mauer, Mure, Mur and Mour all are one and the same.

Halliwell Phillipps tells us that it was at Christmas, 1602, the present play was supposed to have been rehearsed at the Blackfriars, for the Christmas entertainment at Whitehall before Elizabeth, on January 5th. Arabella did a very strange thing three weeks

before that Christmas. She sent to the Earl of Hertford a messenger, John Doddridge. She said that the arrangements of a marriage between her and his young grandson might be renewed, but must be carried out in a different manner.

"The matter," so the message ran, "hath been considered by some of her friends; for they think your lordship did not take an ordinary course in your proceedings. It was thought that the parties might have had sight, the one of the other, to see how they would like each other.

"If his lordship were desirous of this still, he might send his grandchild, guarded with whom his lordship thought fit, and he could come and go easily at his own pleasure, either to tarry or depart."

Then she suggests that the boy should come *disguised* as the son or nephew of one of his attendants, "an ancient man." That they should come from Wales or somewhere, to sell land.

As a fact, one, Owen Tydder, was mixed up with the business of this lover of Arabella's. He was an ancient man of Lady Shrewsbury's, a relation probably of Seymour, who was the descendant of Margaret Tudor; and this Tydder was then living in Wales. He was examined about this message to Hertford, which came to Cecil's ears, and then to the Queen's. The Queen was furious, but Arabella stuck to her lover, and wrote some very interesting letters to the Queen about him. Before quoting these it must be noticed that Owen Tydder confessed that this marriage had been broached "some three or four years before;" and Isaac D'Israeli, in his chapter on Arabella's Loves, mentions the fact that she knew young Seymour long before her marriage. "She renewed a connexion with him," he says, "which had been commenced in childhood" (Page 269, *New Series of Curiosities of Literature*).

Owen Tydder's son was page to Arabella, after "the ancient man" left Lady Shrewsbury's service. Was this Seymour? Did he play the part of page?

Now for her letter. It is undated, but it was sent to the Queen in her last days. She speaks of "that infinitely dear adventure," a mysterious love affair. She says, "I will reveal some secrets of love concerning myself, and some others which will be delightful to her Majesty to understand. I will offend none but my uncle of Shrewsbury, my aunt, and my uncle Charles, and them it will anger as much as it angered me, and make myself as merry at them as the last Lent they did at their pleasant device, for so I take it, of the gentleman with the revenges."

Curiously suggestive of Maria's words in *Twelfth Night*:—"Most freely I confess myself and Toby set this device against Malvolio here. . . . How with a sportful malice it was followed may rather pluck on laughter than revenge."

Malvolio justifies the title of the "gentleman with the revenges" by his words in the last scene:—"I'll be revenged on the whole pack of you."

Perhaps the merry scene with the letter was really enacted at Fowler's expense? It is more than probable he was in England before James's accession. Cecil was busy sending messengers to and fro to Scotland, which would have made him known at Court and to Arabella, if indeed he had not known her when she was a child living with her grandmother, Margaret Countess of Lennox. This is more than likely, as his father was a faithful servant of that family.

Arabella's letters are mysterious, and full of hidden fun. She alludes to her "little, little love;" and in an undated letter to Lady Shrewsbury, sent to the Queen to see, in 1602, she says: "I may compare the love of this worthy gentleman (which I have already

unreservedly accepted and confirmed, and will never repent whatsoever befall) to gold." "He assured me that her Majesty's offence would be converted into laughter, when her Majesty should see the honest cunning of the contriver." This reads like the plot of a play, especially the sentence following: "I am desirous her Majesty should understand every part and parcel of the device, every actor, every action."

In another letter she says: "I am accused of continuing a comedy."

There seems little doubt that young Seymour, then about fifteen or sixteen, was introduced to Hardwicke secretly, either as a page or a messenger of sorts. That Arabella fell in love with him, and that they plighted their troth and were married secretly we know.

In 1609 William Seymour said to a friend, that "by reason of a former pledging of his faith to her he had resolved to marry her."

In other words: "And having sworn truth, ever will be true" (*Twelfth Night*, Act IV., Sc. iii.).

If we formed our own ideal of Arabella at twenty-seven, and William Seymour, when he was invited by her to arrive in disguise, we could not have a more perfect and accurate description drawn for us than Shake-Speare gives us in Olivia and Sebastian, with Olivia's garden for a background. Either one of the glorious gardens described by Ordish, in his "Shake-speare in London," in our great Illyria on the Thames. Gardens full of the flowers that Bacon says are particularly suited to the climate of London, or the garden at Hardwick.

The play seems to place Olivia's garden near the palace of the duke, and we know that London play-goers liked to feast their eyes on scenes placed in their immediate neighbourhood. So we may fancy her garden was at Blackfriars, where Arabella retired, we

are told. There was also a house belonging to her uncle, to which she went, in Broad Street, and there the lovely gardens of the Austin Friars made the City beautiful.

The Sebastian, who arrived at some popular landing stage, Hythe or Paul's Wharf, is just the very same in mind and character, the same virtuous, manly, unselfish, intellectual, warm-hearted fellow that Arabella's lover was.

E. T. Bradley describes him thus :—"A man, indeed, after the poor lady's own heart, very different to the frivolous courtiers by whom she had been surrounded for so long. He was grave and serious above his years, loving his book above all other exercises. What wonder that Arabella fell in love with one whose tastes so exactly resembled her own. . . . In after years her young lover became one of the most beloved and respected men at the Court of Charles I., and at the Restoration respected, so Clarendon tells us, even by the opposite party."

The subtle touch of the scholar is given to Sebastian's miniature in the play. Instead of frequenting the taverns and quaffing his beakers of Rhenish, he insists on first making a tour of the antiquities and other interesting things of the city. A grave and sober youngster, in truth.

He was bound, no doubt, to Baynard's Castle, the residence of Illyria's ruler, Lord Pembroke, as Ordish points out. It was within earshot of Saint Bennet's bells, spoken of by Feste, and was the great place or palace near to Saint Anne's Parish Church.

But it was to Esmé Stuart he was bound, not to Pembroke. Esmé was given Saint John's Gate, at fashionable Clerkenwell, in 1612, but where he was at this time I do not know. During this time the Shakespeare plays were rehearsed, we know, in the Gate. It

is quite possible he may have been a guest at the Castle.

The allusion to Saint Anne's and Saint Bennet's brings us to Feste, and here, too, we have no difficulty in finding his model.

If Arabella was at Blackfriars, her faithful servant, Cutting, was there too, for he had not yet left her, as he did afterwards, for his royal master, the King of Denmark.

Cutting—a wound made by a sharp instrument—is easily converted into Feste, the old French for a wound that is festered.

Tarleton may have been the first clown pictured, but the clown of the folio is Arabella's musician, a lute player of no mean skill, trained by the best Masters (as she says herself in one of the letters which deal so fully with his virtues), and named Cutting.

No one can hear Feste sing his songs and hear him discourse without feeling his superiority. He is a prince of jesters. His remark, "My lady has a white hand," may have a still more cryptic meaning, but I have no doubt it also alludes to Arabella's hand—so white that it was recognised in her disguise on board the boat in which she made her escape from England, and its discovery brought her back again—a prisoner.

"The Mermidons are no bottle-ale houses."

I follow the spelling of the folio. It is strange the modern editions should go out of their way to spell the word *myrmidons*; it obscures its meaning.

The literary club, the Syren, was founded, it is said, by Sir Walter Raleigh, and it met at the Mermaid, in Bread Street, the first Friday of every month. So Edmund Gosse tells us in his "Life of Donne" (p. 86, vol. ii.). He says, "The members of the Right Worshipful Fraternity of Sirenical Gentlemen were twenty-five in number." He gives a few, and when I wrote to ask where I could find the rest of the names I

received no answer. Giffard gives the names as Shakespeare, Beaumont, Fletcher, Seldon, Cotton, Carew, Martin, Donne; but as he says the Mermaid is in Friday Street he is not quite to be relied upon.

“What things have we seen
 Done at the Mermaid ! heard words that have been
 So nimble and so full of subtle wit, flame
 As if that everyone from whence they came
 Had meant to put his whole wit in a jest,
 And had resolv'd to live a fool the rest
 Of his dull life.

Wit that might warrant be
 For all the whole city to talk foolishly
 Till that were cancelled : and when that was gone
 We left an air behind us, which alone
 Was able to make the two next companies
 Right witty ; though but downright fools, mere wise.”

—*Beaumont to Jonson.*

What were these Mermidons of whom Feste speaks? Play-houses? Surely! There was one in Southwark, and one in Hackney—a fashionable resort, where Pembroke had a house—and there was the renowned one in Bread Street. But there is another meaning to be attached to the word. Mary Queen of Scots was called among a certain set the Mermaid, so that it had a political significance as well as a literary and dramatic one.

I close my Notes on *Twelfth Night* with a curious little bit of flower-lore. Gerard has a word to say about the London flower, Clown's Woundwort, which he further describes as All-Heal. Our “Corrupter of Words” was a “Wound-word,” a play upon the word, a corrupter because a Feste. And he, like all the Shakespeare clowns, was a part of the All-Heal system for which his great dramatic creation, our English Stage, was founded.

A quotation from Gervinus and I am done.

"The matter in this play . . . is not the plot . . . but the actors themselves, and their nature and motives; it is not the effect, but the causes and the agencies." And again :

"Shakespeare's first enquiry was as to the kind of nature which could possibly and probably have fallen into the foolish error of a hopeless passion : to this enquiry he found no answer in his authorities, the answer which he gave to it in his play explains it to us on all points."

To Sir Francis Bacon alone could all the details we have gathered together have been known, and alone by him could they have been woven into the incomparable comedy of

"Malvolio, or What You Will."

ALICIA AMY LEITH.

[I must correct my statement made in last issue that Manningham states in his Diary that Shakespeare was present in the Hall when *Twelfth Night* was acted to the Middle Temple students. He did not say so. It was Canon Ainger, the author of an interesting article in the "English Illustrated" on the subject, who says, "There can be little doubt Shakespeare was also among the actors on the occasion."]

BACON'S VERSIONS OF PSALMS.

MR. CHURTON COLLINS, in his *Studies in Shakespeare*, rejects as unbelievable "that a man should by the very poetry of which he acknowledged himself the composer, refute all possibility of his being equal to the composition of poetry to which he never made any claim."

The poetry of which Bacon acknowledged himself the composer consists of versifications of seven Psalms.

Being a lawyer, and therefore, in the judgment of Mr. Collins, "constitutionally insensible of what relates to æsthetic," I had hitherto contented myself with reading what others have written concerning Bacon's acknowledged poetry. Recently I read the whole seven Psalm versions, and compared them with the Psalms themselves.

That of the 126th Psalm is some justification for Mr. Collins' criticism. Those of the 12th, the 1st, the 104th, and the 159th Psalms seem sound and good work, though not brilliant, and yet manifestly better than Milton's excursions in the same field. Milton, on Mr. Collins' line of reasoning, has equally refuted all possibility of his being equal to the composition of "Paradise Lost." Venturing, however, to judge a man's capability by his best work, I should be disposed, after perusal of Bacon's versions of the 90th and 137th Psalms (which to me are simply beautiful), to dissent entirely from the conclusion which Mr. Collins asks us to draw.

After the attempts of both Milton and Bacon, a critic might be inclined to infer that to give rhymed expression to the solemn and sacred prose of the Psalms is by no means easy of accomplishment. He might also have reasonably conjectured that the man who, at the age of sixty-five, wearied in body and fallen from high estate, could produce the version of the 90th Psalm as an

exercise of his sickness, was an experienced poet whose earlier work should be worth looking out for. He would have borne in mind that in 1600 Bacon writes with reference to Essex, "At which time, though I profess not to be a poet, I writ a Sonnet directly tending and alluding to draw on Her Majesty's reconcilement to my Lord." The versifier of the Psalms, at the age of sixty-five, was the admitted writer of a Sonnet when aged forty. He does not say he was not a poet, but only that he did not *profess* to be one. Three years later, writing to Sir John Davis, he refers to himself as a concealed poet. What became of the Sonnet? Could it have been that beautiful verse of fourteen lines beginning:—

"The quality of mercy is not strained,"

and ending,

"When mercy seasons justice,"

which is to be found in the quarto of *The Merchant of Venice*, printed in 1600, the year of Bacon's remark?

The Psalm versions are dedicated to George Herbert, to whom Lord St. Alban says: "It being my manner of dedication to choose those that I hold most fit for the argument, I thought that in respect of divinity and poesy met (whereof the one is the matter, the other the style of this little writing), I could not make better choice."

Poesy then with Lord St. Alban was merely a *style of writing*. How satisfactory it would be could one use the style with equal readiness. This dedication may give some clue to another vexed question, namely, who was the W. H. of the Sonnets?

Assuming Bacon to have written the Sonnets, W. H. was a person that he held most fit for the argument. This should rule out the William Hammond (W. C. Hazlitt), William Hall (Lee), and William Hervey (selected by the author of *Is there any resemblance*

between Shakespeare and Bacon ? 1888, Simpkin & Co.), and leave the field to William Herbert or Henry Wriothesley, Earl of Southampton.

I must now pass to a more serious matter, which seems to have escaped the notice of one so sensible of æsthetic as Mr. Collins. I have come painfully to the conclusion that when Lord St. Alban wrote these Psalm versions he must have had a print of the 1623 Shakespeare First Folio propped up in his bed. What I venture to quote is certainly not to be found in the Psalms from which these versions were taken, and if Judge Willis cannot at once be commissioned to find them in contemporary Elizabethan literature, I fear Lord St. Alban is open to the grave charge of plagiarism. I quote expressions from the Psalm versions, and corresponding expressions from Shakespeare. I do not give references, as they can be readily found in Cowden Clarke's Concordance :—

Psalm 1.—A yielding and attentive ear.

S.—Attention of your ears.

Ps.—And are no prey to winter's power.

S.—Winter's powerful wind.

Ps.—In the assembly of the just.

S.—My oath before this honorable assembly.

Psalm 12.—Unworthy hands. Subtile speech.

S.—Unworthy hand. Subtile orator.

Ps.—Cloven heart (double heart in Psalm).

S.—Cloven pines, Cloven chin, Cloven tongues.

Ps.—What need we any higher power to fear.

S.—The higher powers forbid.

Psalm 90.—From age to age.

S.—The truth shall live from age to age.

Ps.—Or that the frame was up of earthly stage.

S.—All the world's a stage, and all the men and women in it merely players.

Ps.—Thoughts that mounted high.

S.—Honorable thoughts, thoughts high.

And fit my thoughts to mount aloft.

Ps.—Thus hast thou hanged our life on brittle pins.

S.—Better brook the loss of brittle life.

I do not set my life at a pin's fee.

Ps.—Thou buriest not within oblivion's tomb.

S.—Damned oblivion is the tomb.

Ps.—Even those that are conceived in darkness' womb.

S.—Dark forgetfulness and deep oblivion.

Ps.—Our life steals to an end.

S.—But age with his stealing steps.

Ps.—To spin in length this feeble line of life.

S.—Here is a simple line of life.

Ps.—A moment brings all back to dust again.

S.—Alexander returneth to dust.

The way to dusty death.

Ps.—In meditation of mortality.

S.—Meditating that she must die.

Taught my frail mortality to know.

Ps.—This bubble light, this vapour of our breath.

S.—Of dignity, a breath, a bubble.

Exhalest this vapour vow.

Psalms 104.—The moon so constant in inconstancy.

S.—Not by the moon the inconstant moon.

Ps.—Golden beams. Hollow bosoms. Gentle air.

S.—Golden beams. Hollow bosoms. Gentle air.

Ps.—He made the earth by counterpoise to stand.

S.—In the world be singly counterpoised.

Ps.—Tall like stately towers.

S.—Your stately and air braving towers.

Ps.—The sun, eye of the world, doth know its place.

S.—Seek the beauteous eye of heaven to garnish.

Ps.—The greater navies look like walking woods.

S.—Methought the wood began to move.

16 Birnam's wood had come to Dunsinane.

I think with this evidence of plagiarism a Shakesperian jury would convict without waiting for a forcible speech from Mr. Collins, or a summing up by Judge Willis.

Lord St. Alban seems to have had some prevision that fate would not treat him fairly, and that in time to come men would spitefully abuse him, and learned scholars forget to preserve good manners when they tried to measure their own intellects with his, for he closed his version of the 90th Psalm with these lines:—

“Our handy-work likewise as fruitful tree,
Let it, O Lord, *blessed not blasted* be.”

PARKER WOODWARD.

SIGNIFICANT BOOK ORNAMENTS.

EVIDENCE has already been given in *Baconiana* to prove that Francis Bacon not only wrote of and for the *Advancement of Learning*, but was the head or, at least, a member of some fraternity working with the same object, and that the association was secret. Signs of this can be traced in the Literature of the Period. Except some librarians and our own readers, few persons have any idea of the vast number of instructive books which issued from the press in the latter half of the sixteenth and earlier half of the seventeenth century, imparting the knowledge of the age on a great variety of subjects—history, natural history, geography, religion, medicine, agriculture, botany, &c., &c. Many of these works seem to have been intended to contain the whole learning on the subjects to which they are devoted. Some are original, some translations, others profess to be translations, while suspicious facts

raising doubts as to the true authorship abound, and signs that the publications were under some general scheme are visible to attentive eyes. Personal, religious, and political reasons for secrecy of authorship are obvious to any one familiar with the life of Bacon and the history of his time. The plays attributed to the actor Shakespeare, may well form part of the great plan for the promotion of universal science set forth by Bacon. They comprise large chapters in English History and Natural History, viz., the history of human nature, and may be the very part of the *Instauratio Magna* which he is delineated as composing in the fine portrait on the title page of Wats' translation, *Of the Advancement and Proficiency of Learning*, printed at Oxford in 1640. There four volumes, numbered 3, 4, 5, 6, are shown on a shelf above Bacon. Two, numbered respectively 1 and 2, lie beside him. Another is open before him; in it he is writing "*Connubio jungam stabili*"—his pen is on the last letter, *i*. What is the application of this half-uttered line from Virgil? Does the designer mean Bacon to say that he will join in firm union another volume—unnumbered—to the rest, or merely refer to a passage in the Preface of *De Augmentis* on the union between the experimental and rational faculty—or both?

Nearly ten years ago Mrs. Constance Pott drew attention in these pages to the fact that the head-piece ornament of the First Folio "Shakespeare" may be found—with variations so slight as to escape ordinary notice—in many other works printed and published by different persons at or about the same period, and she gave a list of no less than 33 such works, Bacon's *Instauratio Magna* being amongst them. A singular foot-piece ornament which she has named the "Pan" tail-piece, to be found in the First Folio and other contemporaneous volumes, was also noted and explained

by her. In several of the volumes about to be mentioned these head and tail-pieces will be found, but the object of this article is to supplement Mrs. Pott's discoveries by directing attention to a certain significant male figure—ostensibly a mere ornament to initial letters—in a few Elizabethan and Jacobean books possessed by the writer, and to incite research for others. The figure is that of a man in a long gown. Behind him is often a St. Andrew's Cross. Sometimes he has a halo around his head, sometimes none. His attitudes vary. In some designs he is kneeling, in others sitting, in others standing, but he has nearly always a book, scroll, or tablet, in some cases closed, in others open. Occasionally there are two such figures together in the same vignette. Variants of the figure often occur in the same volume. Most of them are to be found in the first work to which our readers shall be referred. It is *The History of Great Britaine*, by John Speed, printed at London by William Hall and John Beale for John Sudbury and George Humble, 1611. At the foot of chap. 6 is the Folio Shakespeare head-piece with the difference of three feathers instead of five in the tails of the two birds. The chapters begin with initial letters in a square dotted border. Behind "B" is a beardless man seated with an *open* book on his knee and uplifting a pen in his left hand. "A" is between two averted figures each holding and reading an *open* book. On the right of "I" is a bearded man with a halo, seated and leaning against a St. Andrew's Cross and pointing to an *open* book on his knees. Behind "H" is the upright figure of a pilgrim with scrip and staff and an *open* book in his left hand. Within "C" is a partially kneeling and averted bearded man with a halo, reading intently a tablet held *open* before him by a child. "N" is in front of a man with a miserable expression of face but a halo round his head; he is admonishing a dog which

stands on its hind legs. Behind "P" is a bearded man seated, his right arm through some triangular object and the left holding up an *open* book. Inside "D" is a bearded man writing in a scroll on his knee. "V" is before a bearded king playing on a harp and seated in a carule chair between two birds, and "Y" is before a bearded man with a sacrificial knife in his right hand and an *open* book in his left. But "T" has behind it a bearded man with a halo, kneeling or seated, holding a *clasped, closed book* in his right hand.

Turning now to another Chronicle by different printers, let us examine the *Annales*, begun by John Stow, and continued and augmented by Edmond Howes—a folio printed by Thomas Dawson for Thomas Adams, 1615. It has the "Shakespeare" head-piece, but with the three tail feathers instead of five. Some of the Speed initials, but within undotted borders, are in this work. Thus the initial "T" of the preface and three chapters is the "*clasped book*" design, and the same figure pointing to an *open* book and leaning against a St. Andrew's Cross begins the chapter on King John and the dedication by George Buc, of the third university of England which forms the appendix. The "H" with a pilgrim commences each of the chapters on the Henrys. "B," with the beardless writer, begins "A Briefe Description of England, Scotland, Wales, and Cornwall" following the preface. Without stopping to point out other peculiarities, initials, head and tail-pieces, mispagination, &c., worth notice in this work well-known to the Bacon Society, let us pass on to another history, viz., *The Historie of all the Roman Emperors*, a quarto printed for Matthew Lownes, 1604. It has a curious frontispiece, and the first initial "I" has no border but the figure of a sage with a halo sitting against a St. Andrew's Cross on the *left* side of the letter and pointing with his left hand to an *open*

book on his knee. This occurs three times only in the volume, and the other initials throughout it are of smaller size and contain no figures. This same initial "I" will be seen in the preface to a *Preparative Treatise to the Apologie for Herodotus* in *A World of Wonders*, purporting to be a translation by R. C., a small folio printed for John Norton, 1607. The initial "T," with the "clasped book" design used in Speed and Howe's *Chronicles* respectively, may be found in a religious work of earlier date, viz., *A Right Godly and Learned Exposition upon the Whole Booke of Psalmes*, 4to., printed for T. Man and W. Brome, 1586, in *Enquiries touching the Diversity of Languages and Religions*, by Edward Brerewood, a 4to. printed for John Bill, London, 1614, in *A Worke Concerning the Truenesse of Christian Religion*, translated by Arthur Golding, 4to printed by George Purslowe, London, 1617, and in *The Institution of Christian Religion*, translated by Thomas Norton and printed for John Norton, 1611. The initial "A" between averted figures reading, which is in Speed and Howes, is also in Holinshed's *Chronicle*, 1587, chapter 15, and commences an address to the reader by A.P., forming the preface of *The first part of the Life and Raigne of King Henrie the VIII.* by John Haywarde, 4to. printed by John Wolfe, London, 1599, and a similar design, slightly altered, forms the initial "A" of the dedication of *The Living Librarie*, translated by John Molle, a folio printed by Adam Islip, London, 1621, and having a curious frontispiece. The initial "P," with the figure as in Speed, is also the first letter of *The Rogue, or the second part of the Life of Guzman de Alfranche*, folio printed by G. E. for Edward Blount, London, 1623—a work alleged to be a translation from the Spanish of Matteo Aleman. The "C" in Speed, but without any border, begins a short address, *Au Lecteur* in *Les Essais de Michel, Seigneur de Montaigne*, published by Charles Sevestre, Paris, 1617, 4to.

Lastly, both the initial "T" with the sage holding a clasped book, "I" with the open book and the St. Andrew's Cross, and the "H" with the pilgrim holding a closed book begin the dedication and the address to the reader respectively of *Sylva Sylvarum*, written by the Right Honourable Francis Ld. Verulam Viscount St. Alban, published after the author's death by William Rawley, doctor of divinity, late his Lordship's Chaplaine. The second edition, London, printed by J. H. for William Lee, at the Turkes Head in Fleet Street, next to the Miter, 1628. The only other figured initial in this volume—also in Speed—is that of the first word of the first chapter, viz., "Digge," it is in a dotted border like that enclosing the other Speed initials. Within the "D" is seated a man with a misshapen profile, a halo round his head, and inkpot in his left hand, in his right a pen. He is writing on his knee. At the end of the *Sylva* is bound up the *New Atlantis*. On the title page of it is a strange device of Time with Pan's lower limbs, liberating a naked female figure—Truth—from a cave. Around this device is the legend, *Occulta veritas tempore patet*. Surely. Meanwhile let our members examine in the Museum, or Bodleian, some more of the prose literature published in Bacon's time and unknown to mere literary men who profess an exclusive intimacy with the poets and dramatists of the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods.

J. R., of Grays Inn.

THE DISCREDIT OF PLAY- WRITING.

I N *Broad Views*, Mrs. Stopes recently wrote:—

“It is quite a mistake to imagine that a good play would have discredited him [Bacon]. On the contrary, the having written the first English blank verse tragedy was, even at that time, considered the highest distinction of a more aristocratic man than Bacon, Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst, a diplomatist too.”

Is it “quite a mistake?” Halliwell-Phillipps says: “It must be borne in mind that actors occupied an inferior position in society, and that even the vocation of a dramatic writer was considered scarcely respectable.”

And Ingleby writes: “Lodge (a contemporary of Shakespeare), who had never trod the stage but had written several plays, speaks of the vocation of the playmaker as sharing the odium attached to the actor. At this day we can scarcely realise the scorn which was thrown on all sides upon those who made acting a means of livelihood.”

But did Sackville and Norton write *Gorboduc* for “the stage?” What are the circumstances? Bacon, at the age when Sackville wrote the tragedy (1559) was quite as “aristocratic” as Sackville. Bacon was the son of Sir Nicholas Bacon, for twenty years keeper of the Great Seal under Elizabeth. Sackville was plain Thomas Sackville, son of Sir Richard Sackville, under-Treasurer of the Exchequer, Governor of the Inner Temple, and was only created Lord Buckhurst eight years after the production of *Gorboduc* which, by the way, like Bacon’s masques, has dumb shows, &c., was “built on classic lines” (Fleay), and was printed without the consent of the authors, under the title *Ferrex and*

Porrex. Mrs. Stopes should know that Sackville and Norton were, at the time, both students at the Inner Temple. As students they wrote *Gorboduc*, not for public performance, but for a Twelfth Night entertainment, in 1560—61, acted by the students, as Bacon's devices were, and witnessed by Queen Elizabeth, who commanded the second performance. This, recollect, was before any *theatre* had been erected in the country. According to Mrs. Stopes, if dramatic writing was so dignified and reputable in the hands of Sackville, it should have been equally so in the hands of Bacon. She forgets that Sackville wrote for his fellow-students—not the public—and his work was performed by "the gentlemen of Thynner Temple." Sackville never wrote for "the company of base and common fellows" (Shakespeare one of them perhaps), who caused the commotion at Gray's Inn in 1594. It was quite another thing writing for the "penny knaves who pestered the Globe and Blackfriars Theatres" (Ingleby), for "such dull and heavy-witted worldlings as were never capable of the witte of a commedie," plays "sullied with the smoaky breath of the multitude," and "clapper-clawed with the palmes of the vulger." [Preface to *Troilus and Cressida*.]

Another point, showing the difference in the relative contemporary estimation of public performances of plays and private (Court) performances of masques and devices is, that at the time "public opinion in England deemed the appearance of a woman on a public stage to be an act of shamelessness on which the most disreputable of her sex would hardly venture." [S. Lee.] How, I would ask Mrs. Stopes, was it, that "ladies of rank were encouraged at Queen Elizabeth's Court, and still more frequently at the Courts of James I. and Charles I., to take part in private and amateur representations of masques and short dramatic

pageants?" [S. Lee.] This distinctly shows that a different valuation was placed on the two classes of performances—that a gentleman could write a masque and a lady could act in it, but that such "privileges" were impossible with regard to a public play, as *Gorboduc* was not. This appears to me to be an additional argument in favour of the necessity of secrecy on Bacon's part in connection with the authorship of the dramas.

BACON'S PATRONYMIC.

LORD BYRON, in a couplet entirely unworthy of him and of which he was probably afterwards ashamed, endeavoured to throw odium upon a very worthy man who had given him no provocation, literary or otherwise, by casting ridicule upon his name—

"Oh, Amos Cottle ! Phœbus ! what a name
To fill the speaking trump of future fame !"

he exclaims, in his *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*, deliberately, or carelessly, altering the Christian name of his victim the better to serve his purpose, and being ignorant, apparently, that the surname, though not, perhaps, so euphonious as his own, was, in point of origin, quite as honourable and dignified—the Cottles or Cottells, "Lords of Cottells Atteward," Wiltshire, being quite as "good people" in their way and day as the Burons or Byrons of Normandy. But, letting that pass, the attempt to raise a laugh on the part of the ignorant or inconsiderate against another by playing upon the accident of his family name was, as above said, altogether unworthy of the writer, who, moreover, is said to have prided himself more on his title of

gentleman than that of poet, and can only be excused on the ground of youthful vanity and impetuosity. Byron was no doubt smarting at the time under a punishment he felt was undeserved, and which drove him to hit out blindly, regardless where his blows fell.

The same excuse can hardly be urged for the smaller wits, who, in these times, take similar liberties with a nobler name, that of Francis Bacon, choosing, either in their ignorance or perversity, to associate it with the ordinary common noun of that spelling. "Bacon! what a name!" they say in effect, "to fill the speaking trump of future fame"—to be echoed on Parnassus, and revered in the haunts of the Muses—Bacon, suggestive of eggs, rather than poetry, etc. No insistence, of course, upon the fact that the association they find so comical is purely imaginary will have the least effect upon these gentry—they must have their facile joke; but, as there are others, who, whilst not joining in their hilarity, may, perhaps, be unaware how little it is justified, it may not be amiss to remind these that the name of our great philosopher-poet is, in all probability, simply the Normanized form of the old Scandinavian surname "Bekan," still preserved in English place-names as Bekansgill, Beaconhill, Beacontarn (where "beacon" is probably a corrupt form of it), as pointed out by Ferguson in his *Northmen in Cumberland*.

What its origin etymologically may be—whether the root-word of "beacon," or, as others maintain, of "beech," it is difficult to say. In either case it is equally honourable, and it may be said, appropriate; for who, if not the father of modern philosophy, is there whose name stands out so prominently as a "beacon light" to mankind; or who, if not the author of the *Novum Organum* (not to speak of the "First Folio"), is there who should take his patronymic from the tree which

has given us the name of "book"? That the name may be traced from either source is clear, the words "bacon," and "beechen," and "bacon" and "beacon," being synonymous in each instance. As illustration, boys' tops made of beech are still called "bacons," and spots where beacons were wont to be lighted are not uncommonly provincially spoken of as "Bacon" hills or fields. Indeed, the boy who, though laughed at, cited Macaulay's famous line as—

"The *bacon* blazed upon the roof of Edgumbe's lofty hall,"

was not so ridiculous as his hearers imagined.

But, whatever the origin etymologically of the name, the Bacons—the men who bore it—were from the very first people of distinction. The Bacons of Molay, in Normandy, were territorial magnates there before the Conquest of England. The first of them is said to have settled in that country under Rollo, acquiring as the reward of his services the seigniorship of Vieux-Molay by Bayeux, since known as Molay-Bacon. Another branch of the family seems to have settled in Maine.

The name in Norman records appears under a number of forms, as Bascon, Bascoun, Bacun, Bathon, as well as Bacon. The first of the name to settle in England was, according to some, Richard, according to others, William Bacon. The name of Bascoun, without qualification, appears on Holinshed's Roll of Battle Abbey, whilst the companion of the Conqueror is described by Wace by his territorial title only—"le sire de Viex-Molei." It is difficult, therefore, to say which of these is the correct Christian name. Other members of the family speedily acquired possessions in England, their names occurring as land-owners in the Pipe Rolls and other records in very early times, in Wiltshire, Somersetshire, Middlesex, Essex, Norfolk, Suffolk and other counties. Doubtless there, in their several

stations, they acted the part of good citizens and loyal subjects; but it is remarkable that, in days when military glory was the great attraction to men of rank and fortune, we find none of the name of soldierly fame. The companion of the Conqueror, indeed, is said to have borne himself bravely on the field of Senlac, challenging, with others, the English king to battle; but his descendants or relatives seem from the first to have been distinguished less by physical than intellectual qualities. The brother of the first of the Norfolk branch was a cleric, and there is, perhaps, no family which has contributed a greater percentage of members to the ranks of learning and literature. The Dictionary of National Biography enumerates no less than twenty-six of the name as worthy of distinction out of a not very numerous *gens*. Of these, of course, the name of our great philosopher-poet stands *facile princeps*; but even without his the list would be remarkable. It would appear, indeed, that the Bacon name was synonymous with "brains," rather than the article of food which the little jokers have in their minds whilst sniggering over it. There may, of course, have been stupid Bacons, but the specimens we have of them on record, from the celebrated "Friar" down to the worthy dispenser of justice in the Bloomsbury County Court, appear as witnesses to the contrary.

JOHN HUTCHINSON.

"THE ETHICS OF CRITICISM."

THE final essay of Mr. Churton Collins' *Studies in Shakespeare*, of which some notice is contained in our last number, has called forth a protest from Mr. R. M. Theobald,* to whom, with Judge Webb, is imputed, with delicate irony, an attack of "Bacon-Shakespeare mania." The situation is not without its humorous side.

Mr. Churton Collins, in his saner and calmer moments an able and acute scholar, has been writing a series of delightful articles on Shakespeare; expatiating with varied illustrations upon the classical attainments of the author of the plays, proving transparently that the author possessed a familiar knowledge of the whole range of classical literature, both Greek and Latin, and exploding the notions of those old-fashioned critics who denied that the plays showed any signs of classical culture, lest these should transcend William Shakespeare's meagre education. In another essay he compares Shakespeare and Sophocles as profoundly moral and philosophic poets. In another he extols Shakespeare's mastery of English prose. Another essay is devoted to Shakespeare's legal knowledge, "extraordinary alike both in its accuracy and extent," by which his mind and memory were so saturated that "at least a third of his myriad metaphors are drawn from it." It suffuses the plays, so that, as Mr. Churton Collins observes, were a play to be found without constant recurrence of legal metaphor and phraseology, that play could not be attributed to Shakespeare.

Now this classical attainment, this philosophic temper, this linguistic culture and this legal knowledge

* *The Ethics of Criticism, illustrated by Mr. Churton Collins.*
Watts & Co., London, 1904.

of the author of the plays, have of late been made the subject of repeated and earnest discussion.

Mr. R. M. Theobald, in his *Shakespeare Studies in Baconian Light*, devotes a chapter to the classical use of words in the plays, showing, as clearly as do the allusions cited by Mr. Churton Collins, how deeply the author's mind was imbued with a knowledge of the classics.

Judge Webb, in *The Mystery of William Shakespeare*, enlarged on the author's abundant use of classic legend, on his familiarity with philosophy and science in their various branches, and his minute acquaintance with the technicalities of the law.

Lord Penzance's treatise on the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy, which Mr. Collins seems unacquainted with, or ignores, insists on the wide knowledge of the author both classical and various, but especially on the accurate legal training evinced by the plays.

Now all these authors, and others besides, concur in and support the view elaborated by Mr. Churton Collins as to the varied attainments, classical, philosophical and legal of the author of the plays. But the humour of the situation is, that he cannot enjoy their support, or accept their alliance, because they each draw the obvious conclusion that the man who achieved and displayed this accumulated store of knowledge cannot have been the graceless Stratford youth, but must have been a laborious scholar, a profound philosopher, a trained lawyer, and also a courtier and a statesman, such as was Francis Bacon. To cite as Mr. Churton Collins does Chatterton's forgeries and Burn's ballads as parallel and equal to the Shakespeare plays, and "equally beyond the range of possibility under normal conditions," only shows how far prejudice and prepossession can warp sound judgment.

As Mr. Churton Collins admits that these notions are

not only "distasteful but repulsive" to him, we may conjecture that he refrained from casting an eye upon any of these inconvenient books, until, perchance, some candid friend pointed out whither his eulogies of the author of the plays were tending, that in fact he was giving away the Shakespearian case, to the secret joy of the Baconians.

So the final essay was written, a desperate attempt to neutralise the manifest tendency of the previous essays. This may account for some disorder of judgment and for the contrast between the vituperative style of this essay, and the temperate and well-reasoned essays which precede it.

Mr. Churton Collins' criticism goes at once astray, in imagining Judge Webb to have been largely indebted to Mr. Theobald. He asserts that "all that is of any importance in Mr. Theobald's contribution to the subject Judge Webb assimilates, and, indeed, summarises." This Mr. Theobald shows is a complete mistake; Judge Webb had not seen Mr. Theobald's *Shakespeare Studies* when *The Mystery of William Shakespeare* was published. The coincident views of both authors is not, however, unworthy of notice.

Mr. Theobald's "most remarkable contribution to the subject is," as Mr. Churton Collins says, "a chapter entitled 'The classic diction of Shakespeare' in which he cites some 230 words for the purpose of showing that the author of the Shakespearian drama was familiar with Latin," some few of these words were newly coined, the others employed in a strictly classical sense. This classic diction harmonises with and supports the classical scholarship, which Mr. Churton Collins, in an earlier essay, claims for the author of the plays. But because of the natural inference that Francis Bacon rather than William Shakespeare was the classical scholar, Mr. Churton Collins will have none of this

classic diction, and deems its citation evidence of reckless and almost incredible ignorance: and for this reason. Judge Willis, with characteristic vehemence and haste, had condemned Mr. Theobald's book, by assuming erroneously that all the 230 words cited, instead of a few only, were cited as newly coined. Mr. Churton Collins adopts Judge Willis' dicta, apparently without examination, and supposes that the occurrence of these words occasionally in other authors, whether in a popular or classical sense, is inconsistent with Mr. Theobald's argument that the author of the plays was a classical scholar. The recklessness does not lie with Mr. Theobald.

Mr. Churton Collins is doubtless angry at the inferences deduced from his essays; but his anger does not excuse the language he applies to the opinions of men, certainly of not less intellectual eminence than himself. “Baconian craze,” “incredible, ineffable absurdity,” “ridiculous epidemic” resembling “the dancing mania of the middle ages”! Such terms ought not to be used of Lord Penzance, Judge Webb, Mr. Theobald, or many others who hold the same views. They recoil upon the writer, they deface a book otherwise admirable, they defy “The Ethics of Criticism.”

G. C. BOMPAS.

SHAKESPEAREAN VERSUS SHAKESPEAREAN.

THE other night I took up a book entitled, "A New Study of the Sonnets of Shakespeare," by a keen Shakespearean, Mr. Parke Godwin.

I found that this new student of the Sonnets disagreed with all his predecessors, and is honest enough to confess himself at a loss as to the individual to whom the Sonnets were addressed. This is what he says :—

"Then, again, who was Mr. W. H., said to have been this 'onlie begetter,' and for whom T. T. wishes all happiness and the immortality promised by the ever-living poet? The answers have been almost as many as the writers on the subject. It was, says one, the Earl of Southampton, an early friend and patron of the poet, the initials of whose family name, Henry Wriothesley, are simply reversed. No, says another, it was the young Earl of Pembroke, who was also an intimate friend of the bard [what a multitude of friends the actor had !]. Not at all, exclaims a third, it was William Hart, a nephew of the poet, mentioned in his will, and who probably purloined the copy. Or, more likely, adds a fourth, William Hathaway, his brother-in-law, who had access to his papers. Or, finally, it was one William Hughes, plainly referred to in line 7, Sonnet 20, although nobody has ever yet discovered who William Hughes might happen to have been."

What an insult to Mr. Sidney Lee, whose *Life* Mr. Godwin professes to have read, and where it is maintained Mr. W. H. was William Hall, the pirate publisher !

Mr. Godwin tells us :—

In the *Fortnightly Review* for December, 1897, Mr. William Archer demonstrated that the Sonnets were not addressed to the Earl of Southampton, but most likely to the Earl of Pembroke ; but in the same *Review* for February, 1898, Mr. Sidney Lee demonstrates that they were not addressed to the Earl of Pembroke, but that many of them were addressed to the Earl of

Southampton. Had the combatants paid any attention to the requirements of chronology, they would have seen that they were both barking up the wrong tree."

This is pretty straight language for one Shakespearean to use to two others! Again, Mr. Godwin says:—

"We cannot fix the precise year in which the Sonnets were written, but we may assign the period within which they were written. It covered the time between 1582, *about the date of his marriage*, and 1592, when he had become more or less famous both as an actor and a play-wright."

So that here we have Shakspeare writing the Sonnets four years before he left Stratford, while he was assisting his father in the butchering profession. It is marvellous! When Mr. Sidney Lee praises William Shakspeare, Mr. Sidney Lee is "a Daniel come to judgment," according to Mr. Godwin. With delight he quotes Mr. Lee when he writes over *Venus and Adonis* and *Lucrece* that these poems were received "with unqualified enthusiasm. The critics vied with each other in the exuberance of their eulogies, in which they proclaimed that the fortunate author had gained a permanent place on the summit of Parnassus."

But the Shakespearean Godwin is not always in this euphemistic spirit, for a few pages further on we read:—

"*A Life of William Shakespeare*, by Sidney Lee. This book has a good deal of pleasant narrative in it, the result of careful research, but is no less marked by wild speculation, arrogant dogmatism, and, in what relates to the punning Sonnets, repulsive coarseness. Its general effect is to degrade Shakespeare very much in the estimation of the reader, as he is made to appear not only an unscrupulous plagiarist, but a sordid hanger-on of the great, and a gross-minded sensualist. Mr. Lee also pronounces some of the Sonnets as positively 'inane,' an opinion that may be taken as a measure of his critical capacity."

Mr. Godwin forgot, when he penned these words, that he had previously written:—

"While some of the Sonnets are crude enough, as Hudson says, 'to have been the handiwork of a smart schoolboy,' they have all of them more or less marks of immaturity."

But Mr. Godwin has not yet finished with Mr. Sidney Lee, for he tells his readers:—

"Mr. Sidney Lee's interpretation of this Sonnet (the 'Will' Sonnet, 135), giving to the word 'will' the sense of lust, is so grossly offensive that it is a disgrace to literature. Shakespeare, 'the gentle Willy,' or 'the sweet Will,' of his contemporaries, was not a blackguard, and could never, under any circumstances, have written to or of any woman whose acquaintance he had sought, that her sensuality was insatiable as the sea."

Mr. Lee has the best of this, however, when he records the fact that Shakspeare seduced Anne Hathaway, and that the only anecdote related of him was the dirty story concerned with the quip that "William the Conqueror was before Richard the Third:" disproving, as he says, "that Shakespeare was known to his contemporaries as a man of scrupulous virtue."

All this only goes to show how these Shakespeareans love one another.

But the best thing in the book is Mr. Godwin's contribution to Shakespearean biography, when he says:—

"It (*Titus Andronicus*) excited more than usual attention, on the part of Shakespeare's fellow play-wrights, and we can easily imagine one of them, say Peele, straying into a tap-house [in search of Shakspeare, *probably*], for a morning dram, and encountering Mr. Greene, who had been there all night, with the salutation, 'Well, Bob, were you at the theatre yesterday?' 'No, but what's up?' 'A new piece written by that stripling busybody from Stratford.' 'Well, how did it go?' 'Bad enough; it abounds in sonnets, or new rhymes of some sort; and yet the people laughed, and now and then there was a burst of this new-fangled blank verse, which is likely to make Marlowe tremble for his laurels.' 'That lad,' muttered Greene, 'must be looked to,' and he was looked to, with a vengeance."

Mrs. Stopes cannot hope to beat this tit-bit of Shakespearean biography.

Mr. Sidney Lee is of a singularly accommodating disposition, so far as his opinion of the Sonnets is concerned.

In his "Life of William Herbert," third Earl of Pembroke, in the *Dictionary of National Biography* (1891), he wrote: "Other parts of the dedication [of the First Folio] prove as clearly that Shakespeare was on friendly terms with Pembroke, and the fact confirms the suggestion that the publisher's dedication of Shakespeare's 'Sonnets' to *the onlie begetter* of these insuing sonnets, 'Mr. W. H.' is addressed to Pembroke, disguised under the initials of his family name, William Herbert. The acceptance of this theory gives Shakespeare's 'Sonnets' an important place in Pembroke's early biography. The 'Sonnets,' though not published till 1609, were written for circulation among private friends more than ten years earlier. . . . Shakespeare's young friend was, doubtless, Pembroke himself, and 'the dark lady,' in all probability, was Pembroke's mistress, Mary Fitton. Nothing in the Sonnets directly contradicts the identification of W. H., their hero and 'onlie begetter' with William Herbert, and many minute internal details confirm it."

This is decided enough ; but by a process of evolution, known only to Mr. Lee, we find him in 1898, in his *Life of Shakespeare*, flatly contradicting his opinions of 1891. This is what we read :—

"The theories that all the Sonnets addressed to a woman were addressed to the 'dark lady,' and that the 'dark lady' is identifiable with Mary Fitton, a mistress of the Earl of Pembroke, are *baseless conjectures*. . . . The introduction of her name into the discussion is solely due to the mistaken notion that Shakespeare was the protégé of Pembroke, that most of the Sonnets were

addressed to him, and that the poet was probably acquainted with his patron's mistress."

"No peer of the day, moreover, bore a name which could be represented by the initials 'Mr. W. H.' Shakespeare was never on terms of intimacy (although the contrary has often been recklessly assumed) with William, third Earl of Pembroke, when a youth." [In 1891 Mr. Lee had maintained that "Shakespeare was on friendly terms with Pembroke."]

"The alleged erroneous form of address in the dedication of Shakespeare's 'Sonnets'—'Mr. W. H.' for Lord Herbert or the Earl of Pembroke—would have amounted to the offence of defamation, and for that misdemeanour, the Star Chamber, always active in protecting the dignity of peers, would have promptly called Thorpe to account. . . . *The Sonnets offer no internal indication that the Earl of Pembroke and Shakespeare ever saw each other.*" Only seven years previously Mr. Lee wrote:—"Nothing in the Sonnets directly contradicts the identification of W. H., their hero and 'onlie begetter,' with William Herbert, and many minute internal details confirm it."

It has taken Mr. Lee only seven years to discover that the "Mr. W. H." was not "William Herbert," but "William Hall," a pirate publisher—a change from "poet and patron" to a common "tradesman," and that the youth addressed in the Sonnets was not Herbert but Southampton.

In 1891, according to Mr. Lee, "begetter" meant "inspirer," but in 1898 it meant only "procurer." In 1891, "Mr. W. H." was the "hero" of the Sonnets; in 1898 he became a casual who stole copies of them for the printer! The *Dictionary* and the *Life* cannot both be correct. Which are we supposed to accept?

GEORGE STRONACH.

QUERIES AND CORRESPONDENCE.

Mrs. Jaqueline Field.

TO THE EDITOR OF "*BACONIANA*."

SIR,—Mrs. C. C. Stopes has been recently engaged on the manufacture of more Shakspeare biography in her Introduction to a new edition of the Sonnets. Her latest is that Shakspeare read all Richard Field's publications, and that "this one firm (Field's) alone printed all the books that were necessary for the poet's culture." This "Dick Field," as Mrs. Stopes familiarly styles him, was also the publisher of *Venus and Adonis* and *Lucrece*. And what gratitude does the moral Shakspeare show for Dick's generosity? In her new edition of the "Sonnets," Mrs. Stopes, in referring to the "Dark lady," says:—"There is no clue to the identity of the lady. Most probably she was not a lady at all, in the Court sense, but one of the rich citizen's [*sic*] wives, many of whom had been educated by wealthy fathers," &c., &c. And then she naively adds:—"Such a one Shakespeare might have met in the very house he *must* most have frequented. I do not *know* anything about the moral principles of Mrs. Jaqueline Field, and do not formulate a charge against her. But such a one fulfilled all the necessary external conditions." Then we are informed "Dick's" wife became the mistress of both Shakspeare and Southampton! It was bad enough to connect the "dark lady" with Mary Fitton, who was fair; but it is surely carrying things biographical to an extreme in decrying the hitherto fair fame of Mrs. Field, about whose "moral principles" Mrs. Stopes confesses she knows nothing. According to Mrs. Stopes, Field "would be able to give Will Shakespeare not only metropolitan advice, but congenial hospitality, and the use of a capital library sufficient for all his needs." And in return for these services what does Shakspeare, the god of Mrs. Stopes' idolatry, give? He seduces Field's wife. It is, indeed, a savoury story, not unlike other stories, however, related of the man of Stratford, and Mrs. Stopes should be singularly proud of her great discovery.

G. S.

Wanted, Facts: The Symbolism of the Dog.

TO THE EDITOR OF "*BACONIANA*."

SIR,—On page 100 of *Baconiana* for April, 1904, it is stated, "Dogs were, in the symbolism of India, types of the Messengers of Truth, and Hunting Dogs figured as *seekers after Truth*." I respectfully ask what authority can the writer give for this assertion, as I can find no support whatever for it in the writings of Cox, Gubernatis, or in Professor J. Dowson's *Dictionary of Indian*

Mythology. On the punch-marked coins of India (approximately 400 B.C., *Journal Asiatic Society of Bengal*, 1890, Part I., p. 181), the dog is represented on the top of the "Stupa," in an energetic attitude, suggestive of the guardianship of Yama, the personification of Death, not of Truth, which has no personal individuality in Indian mythology.

The next statement follows the one above, "A dog with a book before him is the Egyptian hieroglyph for Learning, Science, Wisdom." On what authority does the writer make this assertion? The dog is nothing of the sort, and does not even occur as an Egyptian hieroglyph at all! This I assert on the authority of a responsible officer of the Egyptian department of the British Museum, where, I am assured, that with a single doubtful exception (which cannot, of course, be regarded as authoritative), the dog does not occur as an Egyptian hieroglyph.

Again, on page 101 it is stated, "Æsculapius, the great healer of souls, is figured by a dog." I am confident there is no adequate authority for the assertion that Æsculapius ever *healed souls*, or was ever *represented as a dog*. His familiar representative was a serpent, and we all know that it was his healing *bodies*, not souls, which brought down on him the anger of Zeus.

"At pater omnipotens, aliquem indignatus ab umbris
Mortalem inferiis ad lumina surgere vitæ;
Ipse repertorem medicinæ talis et artis,
Fulmine Phœbigenam Stygias detrusit ad undas."

To allow such errors, as I have above pointed out, to pass unchallenged is simply to give ourselves away to the Philistine and the Scoffer.

W. THEOBALD.

Ilfracombe, April, 1904.

Colonies in America and Tobacco.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—The ignorance shown in most Biographies of Francis Viscount St. Alban's personal interest in our American Colonies is extraordinary. May I quote from our "Colonial State Calendar" [p. 21, 1618], May 1610.

Extract of Patent.—"To Henry, Earl of Northampton, Sir Francis Bacon and others, for the Colony or plantation in New-foundland, from 46 to 52° N. Lat., together with the seas and islands lying within ten leagues of the coast. Reserving to all manner of persons, to what nation soever as well as English the right of trade and fishing in latitude aforesaid, West."

A letter is mentioned from John Smith to Lord Bacon enclosing description of New England, the extraordinary profits arising from the *fisheries* there, and great facilities for *plantation*. To show difference betwixt Virginia and New England. In index,

reference stands, "Sir Francis, afterwards Lord Bacon.") Statute afterwards to be "certain parts of North of Virginia called New England." [Dec. 15th, 1621].

[1617 Jan. 18th.] "Pocahantes, Viginian woman with her father been with the King, graciously used, both well placed at the *Mask*." Proclamation forbidding any one to use import or buy or sell any *tobacco* not grown of Virginia or Somers Islands." [Ap : Whitehall.] A. A. L.

The Northumberland House Manuscript.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR, -In the course of his examination of the Northumberland House Manuscript, Mr. M. le Douse writes that "further on he [Davies] speaks of Bacon 'keeping the Muse's company for sport, 'twixt grave affairs,' an apology for Bacon's amateur verses."

What Davies writes in his Sonnet, at the end of the *Scourge of Folly*, "to the royall, ingenious, and all-learned knight, Sir Francis Bacon," is to the following effect :—

"And to thy health in Helicon to drinke
As to her Bellamour, the *Muse* is wont :
For thou dost her embosom ; and, dost keep
Her company for sport 'twixt grave affairs,
So utterest law the livelyer, through *thy Muse* :
And for that all thy notes are sweetest aires."

Now what verses, "amateur or other," written by Bacon were known to John Davies in the year the above was published, 1610 or 1611? His "Translation of certain Psalms" did not appear till 1625—it was written in the previous year, according to Spedding. How then did Bacon obtain such credit as the above of being a poet at the hands of John Davies?

Curiously enough, the Sonnet following the above is one addressed to Sir John Davies by John Davies, of Hereford, and this Sir John Davies was the courtier to whom Bacon wrote, asking him "to be good to concealed poets," a passage which Spedding cannot understand. It would appear that both John and Sir John Davies were better acquainted with Bacon's poetical efforts than they cared to divulge. G. S.

Thomas Green and Robert Greene.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—I am anxious to clear up the subject of the two Greens, Robert and Thomas. If your readers can help me I shall be grateful.

Knight's London gives Thomas Green as the fourth name on the certificate of the sharers in the Blackfriar's Playhouse. He describes him as a comic actor, of great and original powers. And as so celebrated in one comedy, that a play called *Tu Quoque* was called after him, and his portrait appeared on the title page. The author was John Cook. In the play, Green is mentioned as the Clown at the Red Bull, Bishopsgate.

Ordish, in his book on the "Early London Theatres," says Thomas Green was one of six servants of the Queen who played both at the Curtain and at the Bore's head.

"Licence to Thomas Greene, etc., servants to the Queen to exercise the art of playing in the Curtayne or the Bore's Head." ["London Theatres," *Ordish*, p. 103.]

Here a foot note follows: "This was probably the Boar's Head in Great Eastcheap—Shakespeare's Boar Head."

Cooper in his "*Athenæ Cantabrigiensis*" also mentions Thomas the "actor." In this same work particulars are given of Robert Greene, from Norwich. Born 1560. He matriculated as a Sizar of St. John's College, and, a poor man, travelled all over the Continent. He travelled in Italy, Germany, France, Poland, and Denmark. He had for friends, "notable braggarts" and "spend-thrifts." "Boon companions" who practised "certain superficial studies." "I became as a scion, grafted into the same stock, whereby I did absolutely participate of their nature and qualities." (*Sic.*) Wood further remarks that like Marlowe and Shakespeare, he occasionally appeared on the stage, or that there is reason to believe he did.

He adds, some biographers believe Robert Greene was in Holy Orders, and was a Royal Chaplain, but this he doubts. He died of a surfeit of pickled herrings and Rhenish, "a burning Quotidian Tertian—most lamentable to behold." He was carefully nursed by his hostess, who, like Dame Quickly, kept lodgers. Apparently like her drunken guest, Greene made a good end! "A' made a finer end and went away, an' it had been any christom child, desired forgiveness of God," just as False-Staff did. Had Bacon described his death, it would have been much as the frequenter of the "Boar's Head" is described at the last when he babbled of *Green* fields, with: "Unsteady motion of the fingers as if to take up something from the bedclothes."

There seems little doubt that Greene, like Falstaff, was an actor. That Falstaff was, is clear enough, for at the Boar's Head Tavern, he said: "Clap to the doors—shall we have a play extempore?" And he quotes plays, and takes parts as if born to them. Was Robert a player as well as Thomas, or were they one? Was False-Staff drawn partly from Greene?

Yours truly,

A STAUNCH BACONIAN.

